

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

Anatoli Rapoport, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education, Purdue University
Standards Feedback 09/03/07

The two most principal problems that I see in the new Standards are the absence of former Standard 5 (Individuals, Society, and Cultures) in K-8 Standards and insufficient attention or rather the lack thereof to such concepts as: globalization and global citizenship.

1. Cultural convergence, cultural interactions, cross- and inter-cultural relations have already become critical factors not only in international relations but in our everyday lives. By dissolving the important questions, issues, and concepts of former Standard 5 in other standards, mostly in Standard 3 (Geography), we shift students', parents', and most importantly, teachers' attention away from these extremely important topics. Many recent scholarships demonstrate that the more we ignore controversial but so vital issues of interpersonal and inter-cultural relations, the more difficult it will be to find solutions in the future. All school levels must address these issues. However, considering the time constraints that elementary teachers experience in social studies instruction, it is doubtful that these issues will be addressed at all if not specifically emphasized in standards.

2. By including the term "globalization" (e. g. 7.1.14), Indiana joins other 15 states that have already included this concept in their Social Studies Standards. However, Indiana still refuses to include the concept of global citizen(ship) or related concepts [world citizen(ship)] in social studies curriculum. Maryland and Mississippi already have this term in their Standards. West Virginia has included "citizen of the world" in the draft of their Standards that will be effective next year (2008). I do not see reasons why Indiana should be left behind. There is an obvious tendency in education to pay more and more attention to global issues including global citizenship. I would suggest that this concept be somehow addressed in Elementary School Standards (e.g. "citizens of world/global community") and more directly in HS Standards.

A couple of minor comments:

6.1.15 – "urbanization" is explained as "the growth of cities" that is oversimplification, although later in 7.1.14 the term is defined more accurately.

6.1.16 – term "nationalism": territorial claim is a secondary outcome of nationalism; nationalism, as the belief of ethno-cultural unity, results in the idea of nation (not simply nation), then the elite of the community uses the idea of nation to claim the territory where this "imagined community" resides (aka nation-state).

6.2.4 – definition of "nation-state" is incomplete, it lacks its most important component, it can be continued "...based on the belief (false assumption) that this territory 'belongs' to a nation."

6.3.12 – definition of "anthropology": the so called "four-field" approach is debatable; many consider linguistics a science in its own right and archeology a part of both anthropology and history.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007 Comments and Recommendations

A heading “Standard 4” is missing for Gr. 6 Economics.

7.1.14 – “urbanization” is defined more accurately than in 6.1.15 but “globalization” is presented as a simple linear process.

7.3.11, 7.3.12 – term “ethnocentrism” is footnoted although it is not mentioned in the text of Standards.

8.3.11 – urbanization is again a simple growth of cities; a year before (7.1.14) it was a more complex process.

USG 4.9 – placing “immigration” and “globalization” between “terrorism, ethnic cleansing” and “global warming” makes them negative concepts, emphasizes negative connotations of these terms. “Global warming” is obviously incorrect and misleading term (global climate change). Should the abbreviation USG be followed by a “.” (dot)? In some cases it is, in other it isn’t.

WG.4.9 - WG.4.15 – in the whole “Economic Interdependence” part not a single word of globalization!

GHW.12.2 – more and more research demonstrate that “national character” is a set of stereotypes (usually negative) about other cultures rather than real cultural, let alone national, features.

Dr. Daniel A. Clark
Indiana State University
History Department
Standards Feedback 09/04/07

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SOCIAL STUDIES STANDARDS REVIEW

I thank you for the opportunity to formally review the IDOE Social Studies Standards and to provide feedback. Even when dealing with these standards regularly, upon these occasions to review the standards as a whole and to think about their coherence, I am surprised by the insights. In general I think these standards to be quite solid. They offer an excellent overview of the critical information a teacher should cover in order to produce well-informed future citizens of Indiana. In my estimation the central purpose of a social studies curriculum is to implant a firm grasp of U.S. and Western History with which to encounter and understand the modern world, and by “history” for the earlier grades, I would include an understanding of the interaction of economic, political, social and geographic factors that make up a people’s “history”. With this foundation after middle school, Indiana high school students not only build on their historical knowledge, adding depth, they more pointedly discover how formal disciplines (such as Economics and Geography) marshal information to make sense of the modern world. Citizens need to know not only the history, but also have a keen grasp of the intellectual tools to think through today’s issues when they encounter them in the media and the democratic process. IDOE’s social studies standards offer teachers just such a roadmap for their lesson planning and their students.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

I will break down my comments into three main areas (elementary, middle, and high), and from there address specific grades, courses, and standards. What I found myself repeating in my comments on the standards was the argument that “this or that” topic cannot be omitted since these standards are guideposts for teachers. I understand that the standards cannot be comprehensive, but teachers do use them a great deal for guidance. Consequently, there are several topics or themes that need to be integrated into the standards in order to more properly guide teachers as they prepare their lessons.

A. Elementary

- I. **Overall Comment:** I have always been more familiar with the middle and high school standards. So, it was quite illuminating to examine and reflect on what the IDOE hoped to achieve at the elementary level in establishing a constructivist foundation of knowledge. I noticed that grades 1-8 (even including the middle-school) are highly focused on the first half of American History. On one level I can see the merit in this, bombarding students with the foundational elements of American History so they know the formative aspects of our national saga. Perhaps the reasoning here is that grasping modern issues requires a little more maturity. Whatever the ultimate rationale, I find the strategy somewhat overdone. The United States changes fundamentally after the Civil War, not only from the end of slavery but due to industrialization, urbanization and immigration. The modern US is born out of these changes. I wonder if Indiana students get too much of the “Founding Fathers” and the Civil War, and not enough of an historical introduction to the issues we still wrestle with today that arose after 1880, such as the power of corporations, political corruption, pollution, and immigrant assimilation?

II. Grade Four

- **Immigration:** Addressing Indiana’s history in the context of our national story, I think, is one of the most interesting aspects of the elementary curriculum. The main concern I have, however, is the omission of any standard pointedly addressing the impact of immigration in the time periods 1850-1900 or 1900-1950. Industrialization and urbanization are mentioned (as are the importance of women’s suffrage and Black migration), and one might assume that the topic of immigration might be subsumed by one of these issues. I think that immigration deserves separate and specific mention (not its own standard necessarily but mention within 4.1.12). It is true that Indiana did not receive the influx of immigrants comparable to say Illinois or Wisconsin. But immigration still played a major role in Indiana’s cities and coal mining regions. Clinton, Indiana just this past Labor Day again celebrated the “Little Italy Festival,” and it’s shocking to continually hear Hoosier’s asking how all these Italians arrive there. The northwest and coal mining regions of the southwest (coal was the main reason for the Italians in Clinton)

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

were heavily impacted by immigration. This is an opportunity for Indiana teachers to challenge their students to look past the present seeming homogeneity of much of Indiana's student population, and to consider a time when true "Americans" were rather concerned about the ethnic and racial mix of immigrants pouring in to the nation. At fourth grade, one should likely not probe issues like the KKK in Indiana too deeply (or at all), but an understanding of the ethnic diversity occasioned by the influx of Eastern and Southern European immigrants is essential for grasping why the Klan grew so powerful in Indiana—opposed to these different Americans, their alien ways and the changes altering America. Again, what better way to point teachers toward lessons that could highlight the past diversity of Indiana (teaching lessons for today), while also covering an essential topic for American history generally?

- **Wabash and Erie Canal as an example under 4.1.6.**

III. Grade Five

- **Slavery's Origins:** The obvious purpose of the historical portion of the social studies curriculum of grade five is to impart a solid grasp of our nation's founding period. Yet I saw no mention of slavery. Slavery's origins and importance to the story of our colonial development, the Revolution and the Early Republic are thus obscured. Perhaps the thinking was that these students are not yet ready for such a topic. In light of what they are exposed to in today's media, I find such an idea naïve. Plus, one need not expose all the horrors of the institution. My concern for the omission of slavery rests with its central importance in the development of several colonies and with how it colors American thinking about freedom and democracy during the founding period. Slavery factored heavily not only in the creation of the Federal Constitution (3/5's Compromise, etc.), but also during the Revolution (the British offering freedom to escaped slaves). Standard 5.1.12 mentions identifying the contributions of minorities during the Revolution, and it is true that a significant portion of the Continental Army were men of color, but how to address this standard with little coverage of slavery before hand?
- **Ideological Differences:** Standard 5.1.16 notes explaining the development of political parties and early elections. That certainly is appropriate. The examples noted are just elections. I know we are only talking about fifth graders here, but could we not at least broach the topic of the ideological split between Hamilton and Jefferson? One could at least use the examples section to note the differing views of the constitution or the different visions for the country's future. I mention this mainly because this founding split to me helps to color

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

and inform (thus is an on-going uniting theme) American History at least through the Civil War (and in some ways beyond through today).

- **Economics Standards:** I just wanted to mention that I found the economics standards for the elementary grades to be well constructed.

B. Middle School

I. Grade Six

- **Greek Mythology?:** Under the Classical Civilization category of Historical Knowledge, I was just curious whether or not grade six might not be a bad time to note Greek Mythology. There is a lot to cover in this grade, however, and the standards are rather general. I just seem to recall that this was the age I began to be intrigued by such stories, and they are critical to one's "cultural literacy" in the U.S.
- **No mention of the Scientific Revolution during the Early Modern Era:** Standard 6.1.13 deals with the Enlightenment, which might be assumed to cover the Scientific Revolution. Even this standard, however, pointedly notes the social and political ideals associated with the Enlightenment and makes no mention of the earlier "scientific" breakthroughs upon which a more rational approach to society and politics was based.
- **Civics and Government standards:** In general I found these rather anemic compared to the other social studies standards. In particular, standard 6.2.5's description of exploring how governments "protect or protected" citizens, I found to be a little vague and all-encompassing. Teachers use these standards to help guide their lesson planning, and on that topic no where did I see guidance prompting teachers to consider how governments regulate the economy. This may be subsumed under "protect" rights, but it strikes me that understanding how governments regulate their nations' economies is vital, especially today. The grade's economic standards did not specifically target this either, unless 6.4.4 would cover it.

II. Grade Eight

- **Connections to other Disciplines noted?** The middle school social studies curriculum integrates several social studies disciplines in its approach. I'm curious as to why the standards don't make an effort to paint some of those connections for the middle school grades like they do in high school? I kept finding myself flipping back and forth between the four main disciplinary breakdowns for the middle school standards. I could see obvious connections. The more experienced teachers certainly will as well, but I wonder if the IDOE standards couldn't help out in this regard.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- **The Market Revolution as an Organizing Theme:** Under National Expansion and Reform (1801-1861) for history, I found an important contextual link to be missing. To me the most critical aspect for understanding American History in this era is the market revolution. The rise of a market orientation in the North and among Planters in the South (as much as they tried to obscure it) proves vital when I teach about the diverging regions. This overall understanding of how the country transforms (and why it expanded so rapidly), I think could help inform and guide the teachers when they discuss issues like reform and slavery.
 - **Standard 8.1.16, omits mention of the Wilmot-Proviso:** In accounting for the conflict over slavery, this standard jumps from 1820 to 1854, when the sectional split began in earnest in the fight over the Wilmot Proviso, c. 1846.
 - **No mention of the Second Great Awakening:** Again under the National Expansion and Reform era of the standards, I was surprised to find no mention (even as an example under expansion) of the spread and changes within Christianity. I am no evangelical, but some grasp of how American Christianity grew and became more democratic and diverse in this period would also reinforce issues like reform and abolitionism.
 - **Steam engine should be mentioned as an example under standard 8.1.28.**
- C. High School [*Even though I coordinate the Social Studies program at ISU, I have limited my comments in this section to the three historical courses (US, GHW, and WH), since my expertise in the actual content pertains only to History.]

I. United State History

- **Lack of Attention to Cultural Shifts under Standard 2 (Development of the Industrial United States, 1870-1900):** The same criticism could be lodged under Standard 3. These standards cover the basics of economic and political change for such a turbulent and formative period quite well. My concern is that teachers will not feel the necessity of examining the cultural shifts occurring as a result of the rise of the corporation and a consumer-oriented culture. On a related note, teachers and students might be missing out on “fun” but very interesting topics. I am referring to things like the rise of the department store and advertising, the growth of college and professional athletics (and the interconnected issues of changing gender roles due to industrialization), or the expansion of entertainment (nightlife, restaurants, Ragtime and dance crazes).

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- **Under USH 3.5:** This standard has potential, but as worded is rather nebulous. It notes the identification and comparison of the reforms of Theodore Roosevelt, etc. “with those of J.P. Morgan and Cornelius Vanderbilt regarding big business.” I think it great to have a standard pointedly highlighting how government regulation (what one might consider the beginning of modern liberalism, compared to 19th-century liberalism) emerged to counter the perceived threat posed by a few big businessmen. The examples offered, however, only mention the programs of the politicians, offering very little guidance to teachers (and with no previous standards offering any either) as to what ideas about government and competition people like Morgan possessed. This would be a perfect place to offer guidance to teachers on such subjects as Social Darwinism. Incidentally, I think Andrew Carnegie or John D. Rockefeller provide a better example of a big businessman than Vanderbilt.
- **Under Standard 7, no mention of the Counter-Culture:** This standard covers 1960 to 1980 and does a pretty fair job with the exception of the importance of the 1960s Counter-Culture. One cannot take it for granted that students (or even many teachers today) understand the counter culture. They did not live it (or react to it). I am no ex-hippie wanting to re-live the old days or inflate the importance, but the revolution in morals and manners (as well as dress and music) was profound. It certainly goes hand-in-hand with Women’s Liberation, but it was also much more. One cannot fully grasp the change of the 1970s or (later) the reactions of the Reagan years or the Moral Majority, etc., without understanding the ideals of the counter-culture.

II. Geography and History of the World

Major Flaw—Lack of Historical Context and Flow: I have only one criticism of this course, but it is a serious one. It comes after two years of being deeply involved with an IDOE sponsored workshop preparing teachers hoping to offer this course in Indiana high schools. The course is a great idea. I love the cross-disciplinary mixture of Geography and History. The information bench-marked in the standards themselves, individually I find pretty solid. But if this class truly was conceived as an alternative to a standard World History class as these standards state, then the class as reflected by these standard benchmarks is seriously flawed. As it stands now it is a Geography class with historical examples. The standards tout thinking historically, but they offer no real clue for teachers as to how they expect that to happen. A sharp person can read into the standard a couple of key historical shifts (Standard 4—Exploration, Conquest, Imperialism; and some of the later standards obviously centered on globalization). But the hallmark

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

of a history class is recognizing change over time and making sense of it. The potential is there in this class, but it is unrealized in these standards. It would be completely up to the individual teacher to think deeply and broadly to organize the class in such a way (i.e. to be more than a Geography class with a smattering of historical examples), to impart some coherence on how world history has unfolded. But without a textbook, this would be a major task. Most teachers I talk to are falling back on World Geography texts as their main text. **If the IDOE really intends for this course to substitute for World History, then the standards need to offer some guidance on how to comprehend global historical shifts, how to understand “man-land” interactions with some historical context.** Again, this course has great potential and teachers are hungry for help and guidance. Some few good, experienced teachers will make it work, but the IDOE needs to offer more guidance. Again, as a “history course” this does not work presently as reflected in the standards. On a practical level, teachers will be teaching this as a geography course and (if not guided by standard expectations) will not guide their students toward a broader understanding of historical shifts informing things like population change, migration patterns, or the formation of nation states.

Incidentally, after finding that our workshop teachers really did not have much idea on how to organize such a class, I worked up a sample syllabus that could be the foundation for just the kind of “flow” this course might need to work at its optimum level. Let me reiterate, that I think this course concept to be marvelous, but it just doesn’t offer enough guidance as to historical “flow” or epochal shifts.

III. World History and Civilization

Under Standard 7—Global Imperialism, no sub-standard hits upon the pseudo-scientific, Social Darwinistic rationalizations informing European imperialism.

Under Standard 8—Global Conflicts to the Present, no specific mention of economic globalization. Perhaps it was meant to be understood within the standard points dealing with global expansion of democracy (8.10), but economic globalization (particularly capitalist expansion) and capitalist integration are the forces that are feeding much of our current political and social unrest world-wide. Just for the most obvious example, since “western” values seemed to follow commerce, and many traditional social leaders (as in many Muslim parts of the world, but not limited to them) decry such values, it has fueled anti-Americanism. It just seems that this issue warrants a specific standard point for guiding teachers.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007
Comments and Recommendations

Indiana Historical Bureau
John Taylor, Jeremy Hackerd
Comments on Indiana Social Studies Standards
9/07

High School

- *USH.1.1 and USH.1.2*-The Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 is another important document pertaining to “government” and “individual rights” and could highlight the major theme of “liberty versus order.”
- *Standard 2*-The end of westward expansion in America is an important “social and cultural event” that contributed to industrialism, and affected rural communities and urbanization.
- *USH.3.1*-Need to mention the Great White Fleet (1907-09), and emphasize challenges to the “transformation of the United States into a world power” with a discussion on the Boxer Rebellion, Russo-Japanese War and the Washington Naval Conference.
- *USH.3.1*-Explain why Treaty of Versailles ultimately failed (U.S. Senate rejection, German guilt and remunerations).
- *USH.3.1 and USH.3.8*-The conservation movement is important to note in American history. Discuss John Muir, Gifford and Pinchot (important leaders in conservation movement). Also, highlight movements in Sanitation and Human Health and Eugenics.
- *Standard 4*-What about art? Federally funded art, like post office murals and plays, portrayed American sentiment during the 1930s.
- *USH.4.2 and USH.4.3*-Speakeasies and the rise and popularity of organized crime are two important examples that highlight American culture and how citizens “reacted to a changing society.”
- *USH.4.4*-Hoovervilles and Breadlines are two other important examples that emphasize “American’s standard of living.”
- *USH.4.5*-Make sure there is a clear connection between many of these “reformers” and New Deal projects.
- *USH.4.8*-Make clear that isolationism stems from American and European experiences in World War I.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- *Standard 5*-African-American points of view should be noted. Many blacks began highlighting the double-standard of the United States. African-American soldiers were fighting to liberate Europeans, but they did not receive the same liberties in America. This is an important point to cover before discussing the civil rights movement.
- *Standard 6*-There should be an emphasis on popular culture. Books, movies, rock and roll, toys, the rise of the teenager and consumerism are all important details that will better enhance a description of American culture. Plus, these examples are readily available as primary source study exercises.
- *USH.6.1*- The start of the Vietnam conflict begins during this time period. The fall of Dien Bien Fu and the domino theory are worthy of discussion when teaching about the red scare.
- *USH.6.1*-The creation of Israel and tension in the middle-east should be discussed as a precursor to examining present day situations.
- *USH.6.4*-It is good to discuss the “opportunities for African Americans and women,” but there were still many disadvantages that should be discussed.
- *Standard 7*-Important movements and events left out of this standard:
 - Women’s movement
 - New Left
 - Student movement (hippies, political activism, drugs, rock and roll)
 - Anti-war movement
 - Environmental movement
 - Native-American movement
 - Gay rights movement
 - Television and journalism’s impact on American perception of foreign and domestic policy.
 - 1968 (examples: Tet offensive, assassination of MLK and RFK, Democratic National Convention, Johnson announces he will not run for re-election)
 - Détente
 - End of Vietnam War
 - Energy Crisis
 - Iran Hostage Crisis.
- *Ush. 7.1*-Lyndon Johnson and Stokely Carmichael are two more important names that should not be left off of the examples list.
- *Standard 8*-Important events in the 1980s that need discussion:
 - Corporatism
 - The AIDS epidemic

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007 Comments and Recommendations

- Rise in harder drug use
- Star Wars (missal defense, not the movie)

Fifth Grade

- *5.1.14, 5.1.15 and 5.1.16*-Everything mentioned in these standards is worth learning, but I believe these concepts may be too complicated for a fifth grade student.

Sixth Grade

- The time-span between 1900 BCE-Present is too big. Teachers cannot effectively teach all of the necessary events and concepts in the limited amount of time they are allotted. Everything listed in the standards is important, and should be given adequate time for discussion.

Seventh Grade

- The time-span between 3500 BCE-Present is even bigger than sixth grade. Teachers cannot effectively teach all of the necessary events and concepts in the limited amount of time they are allotted. Everything listed in the standards is important, and should be given adequate time for discussion.

General Comments on Historical Research

- Numerous times on-line data bases are mentioned as suitable for research of various historical topics. The internet is an important and useful tool for historians, but this method of research should not be the only one stressed by teachers.
 - First, teachers need to acknowledge the limitations of the internet and note reputable sites. Only use sites that end with gov, edu, org or where the resource has been digitally scanned.
 - Then, educators must make students go to the library and use books for secondary and primary research. Books still contain the best contextual evidence for historians. Students must learn how to use a library catalog and manually dig for information, and not just by using google.com.
 - Finally, teachers must let students be creative in the types of things that can be considered primary sources. If students believe historians only use musty old letters and documents then many will not be interested. Students can use movies, music, toys, photographs, maps, lunchboxes and radio and television programs to learn about American culture. Also, allow students to physically examine sources and discuss them with classmates. They will be more involved and interested in historical topics.

From: Byrd, Julie

Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2007 10:15 AM

To: Bennett, Pam

Subject: IDOE standards

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007 Comments and Recommendations

I do not have many comments on the standards.

I read Geography/World History and Social Studies, but the standards were so vague that it was difficult for me to make comments. I don't expect any high school class to cover the whole story—in my opinion, they should just pick the main events and teach the students to look at them analytically. It doesn't bother me if they omit the Pueblo People if it means the students have a fuller understanding of the peopling of the Americas, for example.

I commend the standards board for using B.C.E. and for covering the influence of Mesoamerican agriculture.

I wonder how exactly the teachers define "Origins." Hopefully they mention the human divergence from chimpanzees (~6 million years ago). I think young people today have a hard time with the concept of prehistory and time, and this is a landmark on the timeline. I wish that we had relied more on timelines when I was in school, because I think I would have been better prepared to organize the thousands of years covered by survey courses in college.

Mark Magnuson, Ph. D.
Division Chair for Liberal Arts and General Education
Ivy Tech Community College - Indianapolis

Nancy,

Having reviewed the document, and admittedly having to skim some parts in order to complete the review, I noted the following:

1) The concept of the U.S as a global partner and Americans' understanding of other cultures and nations should be incorporated as early as possible in the curriculum in more than a perfunctory way. This is difficult but not impossible and crucial to a students' broader understanding as those concepts are revisited in more detail in the later grades.

2) In the junior and senior years of high school many curriculums fall into the trap of trying to "cover" everything in order to be comprehensive and wind up being a mile wide and a few inches deep..... I was guilty of the very same thing when I first taught the senior curriculum back home. The curriculum appears to ask students to "explain" or "describe" endless concepts. They are all important, but if the student were able to analyze and synthesize broader concepts ie. How do underlying ethnic tensions contribute to civil wars? Then, the standards could subsume the many examples that the students are asked to "describe". Many of the items listed "to know" could be subsets of broader concepts that, if taught, would provide (and test) the student with the tools needed to successfully complete all the standards even if there were not time to actually do all of them in a school semester. Students should be moving beyond lower order thinking by the time they reach their junior year and begin to develop higher order skills.

I could provide more detail and examples given more time. I was unsure as to the depth of the comments you required at this time.

These are the two observations that stood out for me. I was impressed by the thoroughness of the curriculum as it moved through the middle school years and into high school and by the emphasis on history which is often neglected.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the review.

Indiana Department of Education
September 2007

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

Mary Fortney
Humanities Education Resource Developer
The Children's Museum of Indianapolis

Thank you for your letter asking for my comments on the revised social studies standards by September 4, 2007. I'm sending this response by e-mail and will be happy to follow up with a more formal letter.

I am responding to the standards as a person who uses all the standards documents in the various disciplines in my work as a curriculum developer. First, I would like to say that the revised social studies standards are more concise and well written than in the past. I'm sure this is a tribute to your writing skills. The content also remains strong across grade levels in history, geography, civics and government, and economics.

There are areas of weakness, however, particularly at the elementary level. Standard 5, "Individuals, Society and Culture," was originally intended to establish a strand for study of culture and society that would serve as the foundation for social science courses at the high school level. This standard was not as well developed as it should have been in the original version of the social studies standards. It needed to be revised and strengthened, not eliminated. I realize that you have integrated some of the indicators into the other disciplines, but this does not accomplish the purpose. Discarding Standard 5 further narrows the social studies curriculum and sends the message that social studies is only about the "big four" disciplines. It is not about the study of society and culture, especially cultures other than one's own.

At grades K-5, opportunities for the study of cultures outside of the local community, state and nation are very few. These grade levels are dominated by the "expanding horizons" structure for organizing social studies curriculum that has come under a great deal of criticism in recent years. This was also the case in the original 2001 social studies standards, although they included some attempts to leave room for examining connections between local communities and the world. Again, this is an aspect of the standards that needed appropriate development.

In the revised version, several opportunities for a broader perspective have been weakened or overlooked. The focus description for Grade 1 previously read: "Students in Grade 1 examine changes in their own communities over time and explore the way people live and work together *around the world*." In the revised version "around the world" has been eliminated. There are no indicators that support learning about any other part of the world other than 1.3.2 in geography.

The focus description for Grade 3 states: "In Grade 3, students study continuity and change in their local community and in communities in other states and *regions of the world*." Unfortunately, even when a standard supports this statement there may be few or no indicators to back it up. Standard 2, Civics and Government, at Grade 3 states that students will "... use a variety of resources to gather information about government in their community and other communities *around the world*." There are no indicators that clearly support the world focus part of the standard. Standard 3, Geography, states that students will "... explain the geographic relationships of their own community with the state, nation, and *world*." The indicators that might be used to support this part of the standard don't have a strong focus on the world. Indicator 3.3.3 asks students to identify the hemispheres. Indicator 3.3.4 mentions physical and cultural regions, but the context seems to be the location of the local community in a region of the United States. Indicator 3.3.6 mentions climate in the context of climate regions of the U.S. Indicator 3.3.9, which has been transplanted from the old Standard 5, seems to have the strongest world focus.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007 Comments and Recommendations

The intention for Grade 3 to include some content about the world seems clear, but it is not supported by the indicators. Unfortunately, if the indicators are absent or weak, this content will not be taught. From using the standards in other subject areas, I can say that this is sometimes a problem in other areas of the curriculum as well, not just social studies. In the case of social studies, the absence of strong content in Grades K-5 that encourages the study of other cultures and regions of the world is a major problem. There is no other area of the curriculum that has this major function. Basic knowledge and receptiveness to learning about the world should be developed in children before they reach middle school level. I hope that some progress can be made in this area in the future.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment. I fully understand the hard work and sacrifices necessary to produce a document of this kind.

Nancy N. Conner, Ph.D.
Director of Metadata & Collaborations
IHC smartDESKTOP®
Indiana Humanities Council

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed new academic standards for social studies. It was a large amount of material, and I have just a few observations:

1. Incorporating the standard on "Individuals, Society, and Culture" into the first 4 standards, particularly history, seems to have been a successful endeavor. Enough detail was retained to remind students that historical thinking is often based on categories of analysis (women, minorities, etc.).
2. In giving examples of primary sources, it might be reasonable to include some visual materials such as paintings and photographs.
3. The idea of forming appropriate research questions is mentioned in the introductory paragraph to USH.9, but it is not referenced in the indicators that follow.
4. USH.2.7 -- I believe the date of the Homestead Act is 1862, not 1892.
5. USH.2.8 -- The correct spelling is Plessy, not Plessey.

I will be following the progress of the standards revision with interest and wish you well in completing this process.

**Indiana Historical Bureau
Shannon Huckstep
Review of Proposed Social Studies Standards
9/07**

Kindergarten:

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture, but this is okay because they all overlap into the first 4 Standards

1st Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- Possibly include “Pledge of Allegiance” in examples under 1.1.3
- Add to 1.2.1 “and discuss the rights and responsibilities of those in charge of making the rules; duty of authorities”
- Old 1.5.2 and old 1.5.3 were both really good, but they were removed
- New 1.3.9 fits better into Individuals, Society, & Culture category, which was removed

2nd Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- Needs to include more student reading
- 2.2.1 is the same as a first grade standard. How can this be changed to expand upon the previous knowledge without repeating content verbatim?
- A lot of overlap between 1st & 2nd grade standards. Because teachers are required to focus so heavily on standards, how can we change even the wording to imply a difference in content that builds upon previous knowledge without repeating it?
- We miss a lot by removing Standard 5 from 2nd grade
- If the main assessments for K-2nd grades are focused on READING, shouldn't the standards include more explicit guidelines about incorporating reading into Social Studies?
- In addition, we ask 2nd grade students to identify fictional characters. If they aren't reading as much as they could be, then where are those fictional characters going to come from other than television? And do we want them to be drawing conclusions and obtaining more knowledge about cartoon characters on television when they could be given opportunities to draw conclusions about more meaningful fictional characters?

3rd Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- Old 3.1.6 is great! Encourages reading!
- We need to keep old 3.2.5 about the world being divided into different countries with their own governments. That was eliminated completely
- New 3.3.11 is in every grade preceding grade 3; again, how can we modify this to make sure we're building on previous knowledge and not covering the content the exact same way as previous years?
- Old 3.5.2 is still important and should be incorporated
- 35 new sub-standards, 34 old sub-standards. How did we add an additional standard but leave out so much quality information that was in the old standards?

4th Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- Old 4.2.5 is important but was taken out completely

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- Are elementary school teachers required to take economics to get their degree?
- Old 4.5.5 still good and should be kept

5th Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- Slavery not included in new standards about early America or Civil War time.
- Old 5.3.10 is good and should be kept
- Old 5.5.1 & 5.5.3 are good and should be kept

6th Grade:

- Removed Standard 5: Individuals, Society, & Culture
- 21 history sub-standards to 23 history sub-standards, but covering several hundred more years!
- 1900 B.C.E. through present day? This is asking teachers to cover so much in so little time that nothing will be covered thoroughly. Students are not going to be able to retain information that has just been glossed over in order to cover ~3900 years of history
- Unreasonable and unnecessary amount of information
- Chronological Thinking & Historical Research sections of History Standards focus on early civilizations—so why go through present day in the other History Standards?
- When are 6th graders going to learn economics? Who is going to teach them? Economics is not offered for 6th graders at any intermediate or middle school that I've ever heard of; Economics really needs to be a class of its own
- Need to keep old 6.3.3
- Need to keep old 6.3.15
- Need to include old 6.5.1

7th Grade:

- History sub-standards cover a wide time period [like 6th grade history] but seems slightly more focused than 6th grade. However, I still think the amount of content you are asking teachers to cover can be done only if the quality of teaching suffers greatly as a result.
- I like the international relations sub-section of the old Civics & Government standards but these were removed.
- Who is going to provide “historical maps” for teachers to use (7.3.3)? Teachers do not have time to do a lot of research and find historical maps for themselves.
- Again, who is responsible for teaching Economics in 7th grade? Do they know they're responsible for this? Really should be a separate class.
- Old 7.5.2 should be kept
- Old 7.5.7 should be kept

8th Grade:

- Historical Research sub-standards really should be done alongside the other sub-standards—not separately—however, I realize this is up to the teacher's and school's discretion

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- Much better about limiting the amount of time covered; much more specific and limited
- Civics & Government should include something about the VA Plan, the NJ Plan, and the Great Compromise
- By 8th grade, students should be able to name, identify, and/or label states and state capitals. (This is not included in any grades' standards thus far.)
- Again, who is responsible for 8th grade economics?
- Second Great Awakening (old 8.5.1) good and should be included with new standards
- 8.5.4 and 8.5.5 are good and should be kept

Economics:

- I think old E1.5 and E1.6 were combined in new E1.5 but this is not explicit, and old E1.5 is important
- Old E2.9 should be kept
- E5.11 → students must be able to define and understand unemployment and unemployment rate first
- New E8.10 says it related to Individuals, Society, and Culture. (in paren). However, this standard category was removed from all previous grades. It doesn't make much sense to draw connections to this category when it was removed.

GHW:

- No significant changes; standards too new

Psych:

- Somewhere in psychology something should be included about socialization and comparing/contrasting that with psychological theories about cognition and development
- P 4.20- wording is questionable; could seem to suggest that students should have children. Minimal infraction, but might be better stated as "Develop a plan for how parents should raise a child with a healthy personality."
- Include sociology as a connecting subject area (in paren)

Soc:

- S 1.3→ compare/contrast with psychology as well as the other social sciences listed
- S 1.11 is good but should be done after more of a foundation is laid. This is not a foundational skill; it is a skill that comes after a foundation has already been laid.
- The purpose of S 2.10 is unclear to me.
- S 5.1 "Identify and define..."
- S 7.7 "Survey local agencies [AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC]" since the general public are really the ones who determine whether or not something is a social problem; agencies don't get created unless something has already been identified as a social problem

USG:

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

- Individual, Society, & Culture are listed as connecting subject areas, but is this necessary when this standard category has been eliminated everywhere else?
- USG 2.2→include elements of the social contract and natural rights theories in the listed U.S. founding-era documents
- Where do we go into detail about branches of state and federal government? Are the students just expected to know?

USH:

- U.S. Westward expansion and migration hardly mentioned (Gold rush, cowboy schools, problems in the city, etc.)
- Standard 1 was significantly shortened...this is concerning to me
- I like the “Identify and explain the importance of key events, people, and groups associated with_____” in the old standards. They were flexible but still hit on the important aspects of the time periods. These are easy for teachers to work with while still ensuring that the important things get taught.
- Old USH 4.1 and Old USH 4.2 should be included in new standards
- Don’t really like the arrangement of the new standards; they aren’t organized in a way for ease of use. The old standards were much more user-friendly

WG:

- Removed Standard 6: Uses of Geography
- Old WG 2.7 and 2.8 are good and should be kept
- New Standard 4 is better
- Old WG .7 is good
- Problems like Global warming, El Niño and La Niña should be included somewhere in this course

WH:

- Overlap in new WH 2 and new WH 3; this could get confusing
- If time periods were more specific without overlap, this would eliminate some problems and help teachers
- Standard 9 is WONDERFUL! Adding the research element is great!

Indiana Manufacturers Association
Patrick J. Kiely
8-31-07

Social Studies Standards K-12

Kindergarten

We have Kindergarten Standards with 21 standards when Kindergarten isn’t required and therefore cannot be the basis for 1st grade learning. If there are to be any standards for Kindergarten, make them all language arts and math.

1st Grade

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

This may be too advanced. Students won't "explain the meaning of government" in first grade. Civics and Government Standard 1.2.1 says they have a "right to feel and be safe". Where is that? 1.2.3 is excellent if the text is any good and the teacher able to handle the subject. 1.2.5 requires that students "identify civic virtues". Who is going to define that? Serious question. Should there even be Social Studies in first grade? Teach them to read and write excellently.

2nd Grade

2.1.1 Sometimes works with some 3rd graders not 2nd – identify local community and founders.

2.1.7 Requires them to do historical research by reading about and summarizing historical events. Anyone seen the 2nd grade ISTEP reading scores? Take this time to teach them to read.

2.2.1 Identify the "rights that people have" – what source will be used to identify those?

2.2.4 Requires identification of ages, cultural backgrounds and traditions and explain their contributions to the community. This standard is statewide. How can a text or curriculum address the broad differences that exist in student populations?

3rd Grade

Students will describe "significant people, events and developments". Who will choose those?

The History standard is good if the teacher is a decent history student and the text is down the middle.

The Civics and Government standards are open to bias from teacher or text.

The Human Systems section requires value judgments with uncontrolled sourcing and should probably be deleted.

4th Grade

Good history section. 4th grade has traditionally been the time for introducing Indiana History and the standards are very good if the text and teacher are. 4.1.14 – the last history standard – practically ignores manufacturing, however.

The Civics and government section falls a bit short particularly in using terms like "major rights" – what are major rights and what aren't? Who decides? It also uses terms like "reasoned patriotism" – whose reasoning will be applied. Why limit the term patriotism?

The geography standards –applying to Indiana are quite good – if the text supports that.

5th Grade

The History standards are solid. The Historical research section invites the use of fiction works. It should stick to historically accurate non-fiction sources. The Civics and government section in standard 5.2.5 uses the terms "citizens rights in the Bill of Rights". That is a false statement. Neither the Bill of Rights nor any other document grants rights – it limits the power of government. That this is falsely characterized teaches students that their rights come from government when the reverse is the case. It is a fatal flaw in that standard.

6th Grade

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007

Comments and Recommendations

The Foundations of government section is good. The functions of government sections treats international organizations as if they are governments. Geography is ok – but again depends on a good text. The environment and Society section may invite bias. The economics section is all commerce and finance and no manufacturing 6.4.1 through 6.4.10.

7th Grade

This is Africa, Asia and Southwest Pacific. It is far too detailed. If Social Studies must be taught in 7th – taking time away from language arts and math skills they'll require when they get a GPA to maintain in high school then this should be world history with a tiny section on Africa, Asia and Southwest Pacific. The geography section is good if it requires perfecting location techniques for future use.

8th Grade

Finally – advanced US History! History has 31 standards and only one of them is Civil War. This needs more emphasis. Under 8.1.33 should be included work on the ratification process of the Constitution. It is not mentioned at all and if you don't understand that you don't really understand the Constitution. Under civics there is frequent reference to the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom. Worthy of understanding, but the emphasis as if it was a major work in American history indicates a bias toward "separation of church and state" that the Framers did not write into the Constitution. It mentions "freedom of conscience" - no such right is protected. Such a view is a basis for arguing that the Constitution is a malleable living document. Citizenship section is good. The Geography section is good - but careful! Environmental discussions invite bias.

9-12 Subject oriented standards by course

United States History – 2 credits required in all diploma tracks

Separated into time periods. It gives short shrift to the Civil War. Of the 6 standards covering 1939-1945, only one involves the events of World War II and only in part. USH 5.5 should be rolled into USH 5.6 and WW II given more time and attention. USH 7.3 uses *Miranda v. Arizona* as an example of "federal programs and policies designed to improve the lives of Americans". *Miranda* is a Supreme Court case on criminal procedure and has nothing to do with federal programs or policies. This is a GROSS error. USH 8.6 Gives the Kyoto Protocols as an example of the impact of globalization. Kyoto was not ratified and has not force or effect in the United States – it is there only for pro-environmental bias. The Historical Thinking and Research section should be minimized to allow more time for US History teaching. Knowing our history is a basis for good citizenship.

United States Government – 1 credit required in all diploma tracks

Standard 2 on Foundations of the Government of the United States is very solid and should be the most important to this course. Standard 2 on Purposes, Principles and Institutions of Government in the United States is good but has one glaring error. In USG 3.6 "implied" powers of the US are mentioned for comparison or contrast. By the terms

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007 Comments and Recommendations

of the Bill of Rights, there are no implied powers of the Federal Government. Standard 5 Roles of Citizens in the United States is ok but with errors – USG 5.5 should have the word embedded removed and be replaced with acknowledged.

World History and Civilization – alternative class for 1 credit in Core 40 or as elective in other tracks.

This has 66 standards for a class of 1 credit. How will all this be covered – or will it? This should be a requirement and pre-requisite to US History. These are very solid standards. As an alternative for 1 hour, the complexity might drive students away.

World Geography – alternative class for 1 credit in Core 40 or as an elective in other tracks.

This is a solid set of standards. WG 2.1 identifying major global features such as continents and oceans should get more emphasis. WG 3.5 regarding making a map with recent earthquakes apparently ignores the fact that there is such a map – world and regional online with minute to minute events arrayed by magnitude. WG 4.19 and WG 4.20 should be deleted – they deal with conflict, politics and international organizations none of which is geography. WG 5.1 should be deleted. It is loaded for bias by assuming a fact not in evidence without finding the facts under another standard– human cause or threats to the world’s environment.

Geography and History of the World – alternative class for 1 credit in Core 40 or 1 for Honors.

This proposal has 56 standards in 22 pages for one alternative credit. This should not be adopted as is. It should be divided into classes on Geography and World History and covered there. This is far too complex for the weight the course is given within the curriculum and graduation requirements.

Economics – 1 credit required in Core 40 but not in other tracks.

This course is heavily dependent upon the text and teacher for objectivity. E 4.2 and all of E5 require a lot of value judgments to be imparted.

Psychology – 1 credit class not required in any diploma track.

This contains 101 standards in a class that will met not more than 90 times for credit in a class not required to graduate in any track. Track one is teaching the “scientific method”. That should be taught in Biology 1 and practiced in Zoology and Chemistry before you get to this. The analysis and mental health sections are wide open for bias.

Sociology – 1 credits class not required in any diploma track.

This contains 85 standards for a class that will meet no more than 90 times for credit in a class not required to graduate. If it is to be adopted at all, it should be pruned back – at the high school level – to vocabulary, definitions, measurement technology, surveying and examinations of studies on main stream subjects and left at that. Demographic measurement and studies could be added.

Proposed Social Studies Standards Update 2007
Comments and Recommendations